

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 21-0068V

UNPUBLISHED

MARY ROSS,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: November 9, 2022

Special Processing Unit (SPU);
Damages Decision Based on Proffer;
Influenza (Flu) Vaccine; Shoulder
Injury Related to Vaccine
Administration (SIRVA)

Michael Adly Baseluos, Baseluos Law Firm, PLLC, San Antonio, TX, for Petitioner.

Steven Santayana, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for Respondent.

DECISION AWARDING DAMAGES¹

On January 5, 2021, Mary Ross filed a petition for compensation under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, 42 U.S.C. §300aa-10, *et seq.*² (the “Vaccine Act”). Petitioner alleges that she suffered a left shoulder vaccine related to vaccine administration (“SIRVA”) resulting from an influenza vaccine received on September 18, 2020. Petition at 1. Petitioner further alleges that the vaccine was received in the United States, she suffered the sequela of her injury for more than six months, and she has not received compensation in the form of an award or settlement, or filed a civil action, for her vaccine-related injuries. Petition at 1; Ex. 10 at 8, 10. The case was assigned to the Special Processing Unit of the Office of Special Masters.

On November 9, 2022, a ruling on entitlement was issued, finding Petitioner entitled to compensation for SIRVA. On November 9, 2022, Respondent filed a proffer on

¹ Because this unpublished Decision contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, I am required to post it on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002. 44 U.S.C. § 3501 note (2012) (Federal Management and Promotion of Electronic Government Services). **This means the Decision will be available to anyone with access to the internet.** In accordance with Vaccine Rule 18(b), Petitioner has 14 days to identify and move to redact medical or other information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy. If, upon review, I agree that the identified material fits within this definition, I will redact such material from public access.

² National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-660, 100 Stat. 3755. Hereinafter, for ease of citation, all section references to the Vaccine Act will be to the pertinent subparagraph of 42 U.S.C. § 300aa (2012).

award of compensation (“Proffer”) indicating Petitioner should be awarded \$125,657.50. Proffer at 7-8. In the Proffer, Respondent represented that Petitioner agrees with the proffered award. *Id.* Based on the record as a whole, I find that Petitioner is entitled to an award as stated in the Proffer.

Pursuant to the terms stated in the Proffer, **I award Petitioner a lump sum payment of \$125,657.50 (comprised of \$125,000.00 for pain and suffering and \$657.50 for out of pocket medical expenses) in the form of a check payable to Petitioner.** This amount represents compensation for all damages that would be available under Section 15(a).

The Clerk of Court is directed to enter judgment in accordance with this decision.³

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Brian H. Corcoran
Brian H. Corcoran
Chief Special Master

³ Pursuant to Vaccine Rule 11(a), entry of judgment can be expedited by the parties’ joint filing of notice renouncing the right to seek review.